



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,970	03/27/2001	Raj Bridgelall	1128	4228

7590 03/31/2003

Daniel R. McGlynn  
Symbol Technologies, Inc.  
One Symbol Plaza, MS A-6  
Holtsville, NY 11742

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIMBERLY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/819,970

Applicant(s)

BRIDGELALL ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3 January 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.      6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Amendment*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 3 January 2003.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4-8, 10-19, 21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ruppert et al. (US 5,640,002; hereinafter “Ruppert”).

Ruppert teaches a data collection module, comprising:

a support 298 having a predetermined form factor;

a first auto ID reader 314 (col. 21, lines 63+) supported by the support, the first auto ID reader operative for sensing encoded data on a first type of record carrier positioned near the first auto ID reader and for reading the encoded data;

a second auto ID reader (magnetic head) (col. 17, lines 13+) supported by the support, and operative for sensing encoded data on a second type of record carrier configured to contact a portion of the second auto ID reader, the second auto ID reader further operative for reading the encoded data; and

Art Unit: 2876

a radio frequency (RF) transceiver 307 (col. 20, lines 53+) supported by the support, and operative for transmitting the data processed by the auto ID readers derived from the record carriers (see figures 10, 16, 19; col. 17, line 8+, col. 21, line 63 through col. 23, line 38).

Re claims 5-6, 24: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein the magnetic stripe reader includes a sensor, wherein the RF reader and magnetic readers are supported within the support (see figures 16, 19; col. 17, line 8+).

Re claims 4, 11, 23: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein the RF reader has a receiving antenna and a transmitting antenna for sending and receiving RF data (see figure 44).

Re claims 7, 14, 17-19: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein the RF transceiver and the auto ID readers generate digital signals corresponding to the RF demodulated data and the auto ID encoded data respectively, and wherein the readers share a single IC (see figure 19).

Re claim 10: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein the support includes a printed circuit board on which electrical circuit components for the RF transceiver and auto ID readers are mounted (see figures 16, 19; col. 17, line 8+).

Re claim 12: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein at least one auto ID reader includes a photodiode, which serves as photodetector (fig. 19; col. 23, lines 55).

Re claim 16: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein the first auto ID reader is a barcode reader and the second auto ID reader is a smart card reader (fig. 3; abstract; col. 5, lines 40+).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-3, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruppert in view of "admitted prior art". The teachings of Ruppert have been discussed above.

Re claim 2: Ruppert is silent with respect to the form factor space approximation.

The applicant discloses a well known SE 1200 scan engine module and is produced by Symbol Technologies, Inc. which has a parallelepiped shape measuring 1-1/2 inch x 1 inch x  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch (page 4, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the notoriously old and well known form factor of the scan module and the auto ID reader along with RF transmitter are mounted on the circuit board to the teaching of Ruppert in order to provide a versatile and compact card reader system, which provides a greater convenience to the users for carrying the reader system.

Re claim 3: Ruppert teaches a data collection module, wherein the support includes a printed circuit board on which electrical circuit components for the RF transceiver are mounted (see figures 16, 19; col. 17, line 8+).

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruppert in view of Dvorkis et al. (US 5,705,800; hereinafter "Dvorkis"). The teachings of Ruppert have been discussed above.

Art Unit: 2876

Ruppert fails to teach or fairly suggest that the support has a form factor occupying a space for an SE 1200 scan engine.

Dvorkis disclose a laser scanner system for controlling the optical scanning of bar code comprising: a bar code scanner having a form factor that occupies by a scan engine 1200 (see col. 14, line 8+).

In view of Dvorkis's teachings, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the support system as taught by Dvorkis to the teachings of Ruppert to accommodate a san engine 1200 for providing more flexibility in the system. Such modification would facilitate a more compact design which would enable the system to operate more effective. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Ruppert.

4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruppert in view of Wang (US 6,175,922). The teachings of Ruppert have been discussed above.

Ruppert fails to teach or fairly suggest wireless communications using the Bluetooth protocol.

Wang teaches a wireless data communication system using Bluetooth protocol (col. 19, lines 15-65).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Bluetooth protocol for wireless communication as taught by Wang to the teachings of Ruppert in order to provide the latest wireless communication technology within the system. Such modification would provide Ruppert with a more efficient data communication system with latest wireless technology.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Morrison (US 6,112,857) teaches hand-held scanner device having a smart card associated therewith and associated method. Isaac et al. (US 5,744,791) teaches solar energy-powered optical reader.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2876

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-305-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-8792.



KDN  
March 17, 2003

**THIEN M. LE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**